

While Mr. Roosevelt is boasting of the anti-trust legislation passed by the republican congress, he ought not to forget to explain how it happened that immediately after all this anti-trust legislation was accomplished, the packers began the organization of a combine which in power and wealth will be second only to the great steel trust.

### How Did It Happen?

In his speech at Milwaukee, President Roosevelt quoted some things from the famous address he delivered at Minneapolis when he was vice president. But one statement in the Minneapolis speech Mr. Roosevelt did not refer to and that was wherein he said that it would be necessary in the future to shackle cunning as in the past we had shackled force.

### Force and Cunning.

The Chicago Tribune says: "The result in Cleveland leaves Mayor Tom L. Johnson the most conspicuous democrat in Ohio. If he wishes the party nomination for governor he can have it, and repeat his spectacular automobile campaign of 1902." Yes, and it will give the people of Ohio the opportunity of electing to the office of governor a man who will be a faithful representative of the people.

### The Cleveland Victory.

In several of the speeches which the president is now delivering on his famous tour, he has referred with considerable detail to what the administration has done in enforcing the Sherman anti-trust law. But it cannot have escaped the observation of the people that Mr. Roosevelt has not undertaken to explain why the criminal provision which is the chief feature of the Sherman law has not been enforced.

### That Criminal Clause.

In his annual message, President Roosevelt recommended the appointment of a tariff commission whose duty it would be to revise the tariff. And yet in the speeches which the president is now making, we read no reference to a tariff commission. On the contrary, the president's opinion as to the desirability of tariff revision under any circumstances appears to have undergone radical change since he wrote his annual message to congress.

### That Tariff Board.

The New York Tribune says that "no man who fairly faces the question can say the machinery of government ought not to be employed in breaking them (practices of the trusts) up." Then why has the republican administration failed to employ the "machinery" as provided in the Sherman anti-trust law in order to accomplish this end? Why does it object to the removal of the shelter which the trusts find in the tariff and why has it neglected to enforce the criminal clause of the Sherman anti-trust law?

### Put It In Motion.

In an effort to establish harmony among the reorganizers, the Brooklyn Eagle says that "there is room for all and relative place for all." And then the Eagle cheerfully proceeds to read out of the democratic party the democrats who believe in the principles set forth in the democratic national platform. But it must be understood that when papers like the Eagle say there is room for all, they take it for granted that their readers understand that they mean all but democrats who believe in democratic principles and support democratic tickets.

### Room for all but—

The Baltimore Herald says: "If a drouth such as prevailed two years ago in the west should be repeated this year, the trusts would have the country in their grip. Any sort of trust is bad enough, but one that can control any necessary of life is particularly oppressive. It would seem that the western farmers and ranchmen who are prosperous could unite and form a big company to manage the slaughtering and distribution of meat so as to reap the profits of the business themselves, treating the people fairly at the same time, and thus rid themselves from the oppression of the trusts.

### Looking for Relief.

That or some other plan will be hit upon. The trusts have invited war, and it will be war if any worse extortion is attempted."

In his speech delivered at Chicago, President Roosevelt said: "Boasting and blustering are as objectionable among nations as among individuals, and the public men of a great nation owe it to their sense of national self-respect to speak courteously of foreign powers, just as a brave and self-respecting man treats all around him courteously. But though to boast is bad, and causelessly to insult another, worse, yet worse than all is it to be guilty of boasting, even without insult, and when called to the proof to be unable to make such boasting good." It is not in the least surprising that this statement is interpreted by Admiral Dewey's friends as a reflection upon the hero of Manila Bay. And yet is it unfair to say that Mr. Roosevelt himself is a bit given to "boasting and blustering?"

### Boast and Bluster.

The Sioux City Journal, a republican paper that is in favor of removing the shelter which the trusts find in the tariff, is engaged in a heated argument with the American Economist. The Economist says that if Governor Cummins undertakes to carry out his threat to raise this question in the national convention, "what would happen to him and his faction is not difficult to foresee." But the Journal thinks that the Economist is not well informed. There are a great many people who will be inclined to believe that the editor of the Economist knows just what he is talking about; and the editor of the Journal might have his doubts removed if he would give intelligent observation to the remarkable change that has taken place in Mr. Roosevelt's position on this question since the date of his annual message to congress.

### The Economist Knows.

W. McDougall, writing in Nature, indorses the theory of James Sully that laughter is not all joy, but that "there is in it from the first ejaculation something of a biting sensation, or something of a melancholy pain;" and again, "the laughable spectacle commonly shows us in the background something regrettable." Whatever may be said as to the correctness of the position taken by Messrs. Sully and McDougall, it is safe to say that if the eminent reorganizers—who, prior to election day, were preparing to indulge in a good laugh because of the returns from the municipal elections in Chicago and in Cleveland, O.—carried out their original plans, that in their laughter it was evident that "from the first ejaculation there was something of a biting sensation or something of a melancholy pain."

### A Biting Sensation.

The Des Moines Register and Leader, a republican paper, says that Secretary Root was undoubtedly speaking for the president when he made a vigorous protest against tariff tinkering at the coming session of congress. According to the Register and Leader, "a prolonged tariff debate with its consequent irritation will be used by the democrats as a basis of their campaign," therefore the plan seems to be to put into the national platform the republican program and then carry it out in the first congress following the national election. The Register and Leader says that it is important that every state convention say clearly and definitely what it believes should be the policy for the future. A very interesting program to be sure, but the Register and Leader may just as well understand now that there will be no "Iowa idea" in the republican platform.

### Dealing in Futures.

The Chicago Record-Herald says that "the 'Iowa idea' was triumphant in the western and northwestern states in the last congressional election. The people are disposed to take the party at its word in characterizing the tariff as a business and economic proposition, to be changed according to the needs of our changing industrial conditions." Then the Record-Herald asks, "Do the republican leaders mean to abandon this position?" The truth is that the republican leaders never intended to take this position. They were quite willing, to be sure, that voters who favored the "Iowa idea" should lay the flattering unction to their souls that that plank would be adopted; but if the Record-Herald has now doubts on this point, it might

### The Iowa Idea.

learn something to its advantage by a careful reading of the speeches which Mr. Roosevelt is now delivering.

Senator Warren of Wyoming has written a letter in which he objects to the election of United States senators by popular vote. Senator Warren says that this plan "would develop a desire for and greatly increase the probability of apportioning the senate according to the voting strength" of the several states. This, while increasing the representation of the older eastern states, he says, "would carry the western states back to one senator from each state, or possibly one senator for a group of two or three states." Senator Warren's letter moves the New York American to say that a United States senator should be better acquainted with the constitution of his country than Mr. Warren appears to be, and the American directs attention to article V. of the constitution in which it is said: "No state without its consent shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the senate." But perhaps when the constitution quit following the flag Warren lost track of it.

### It Don't Follow Warren.

The New York Journal of Commerce prints in its editorial columns an interesting letter omitting names. The Journal of Commerce assures its readers that the letter is authentic. The letter was written by an Englishman to a citizen of the United States, and speaks for itself as follows: "We have had one of the trust men here — of — he showed me one of his balance sheets the — of — made up to December, 1902, showing over 100 per cent profit and paying a dividend. At this rate he got as his share about \$20,000 and told me he had received this rate for several years. The amount carried forward to next account was nearly 200 per cent. Pretty good for the iron trade, don't you think? I told him that if his government were foolish enough to adopt free trade, we would soon knock his profits down to a modest rate. He very complacently said: 'But they won't.' What a contrast between that and what we can do in England! If we get a 10 or 15 per cent we can sell our business at a big premium and have many buyers."

### Trusts and Tariff.

The religious beliefs of Abraham Lincoln are again being discussed and while many insist that Mr. Lincoln was a believer, one affirms that he "denied the very existence of God." It does not seem possible for one who has read Lincoln's writings and speeches to accept the latter version. Throughout his public utterances his references to the Creator were made in such reverent tone and the principles he espoused were so closely associated with the principles of the Master that it seems unnecessary at this day to agitate the old time controversy. Who can forget that masterly speech wherein Mr. Lincoln said that "our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in our bosom;" or that splendid letter to the grief-stricken mother who had lost five sons on the field of battle, in which letter Mr. Lincoln said that "I pray that our Heavenly Father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement;" or other testimony to Mr. Lincoln's firm belief in the Creator, including the eloquent peroration to his Emancipation Proclamation wherein he invoked upon that act "the considerate judgment of mankind and the gracious favor of Almighty God."

### Mr. Lincoln's Belief.

The Kansas City Journal, a republican paper, says that ostensibly the president and the coal strike commission appeared on the scene in the interests of the people and it thinks that the commission performed a good service in bringing the strike to an end and raising the coal famine. But the Journal adds: "But there may be a difference of opinion as to the satisfactory character of the commission's final decision. If we indorse it, we must do so from the basis that as consumers we are willing to pay the miners more money. Furthermore, it appears that we must indorse an effect which the decision carried along—the effect of paying the operators more profits while paying the miners more wages." Is it not possible that the same public sentiment that forced the coal barons to do partial justice to their employees will in time require the coal barons to do justice to the coal consumers? Or must we accept the views evidently entertained by these republican papers that the coal barons are all powerful and that the public must submit to whatever program the barons may see fit to outline?

### Public Must Submit.